arXiv:hep-ph/0611215v2 3 Mar 2009

Bounds on Tensor operator contribution to $B_s \rightarrow l^+ l^- \gamma$

Ashutosh Kumar Alok[1] and S. Uma Sankar[2]

[1] *Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai-400076, India and*
Tata Institute of Fundamental Research,
Homi Bhabha Road, Mumbai 400005, India

[2] *Indian Institute of Technology Bombay, Mumbai-400076, India*

We consider the effect of new physics interactions in the form of tensor operators on the branching ratio of $B_s \rightarrow l^+l^-\gamma$ where $l = e, \mu$. We find that the present data on the inclusive branching ratio $B \rightarrow X_s l^+l^-$ puts a strong constraint on the new physics tensor couplings and does not allow a large enhancement in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \rightarrow l^+l^-\gamma)$ beyond its standard model predictions. Large enhancement in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \rightarrow l^+l^-\gamma)$ due to new physics in the form of vector/axial-vector, scalar/pseudoscalar and magnetic dipole operators has already been ruled out. Thus we conclude that no new physics can provide a large enhancement in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \rightarrow l^+l^-\gamma)$ and hence it is expected to be observed in future experiments with a branching ratio close to its standard model expectation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The quark level interaction $b \to s l^+ l^-$, where $l = e,\ \mu$, is responsible for the (a) inclusive semi-leptonic decay $B \to X_s l^+ l^-$ (b) exclusive semi-leptonic decays $B \to (K^*, K) l^+ l^-$, (c) purely leptonic decays $B_s \to l^+ l^-$ and also (d) leptonic radiative decays $B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma$. The inclusive and exclusive semi-leptonic decays have been observed experimentally [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] with branching ratios close to their Standard Model (SM) predictions [7, 8, 9, 10]. However the decays $B_s \to l^+ l^-$ and $B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma$ are yet to be observed.

The mode $B_s \to l^+ l^-$ is helicity suppressed and the SM predictions for the branching ratios of the decays $B_s \to e^+ e^-$ and $B_s \to \mu^+ \mu^-$ are $(7.58 \pm 3.5) \times 10^{-14}$ and $(3.2 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-9}$ respectively [11]. In [12] we studied the relation between the semi-leptonic decays $B \to (K^*, K) l^+ l^-$ and the purely leptonic decays $B_s \to l^+ l^-$. We found that if new physics interactions are in the form of vector/axial-vector operators then the present data on the branching ratio of $B \to (K^*, K) l^+ l^-$, $\mathcal{BR}(B \to (K^*, K) l^+ l^-)$, doesn't allow a large enhancement in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+ l^-)$ beyond the SM predictions. But if new physics interactions are in the form of scalar/pseudoscalar operators then the present data on $\mathcal{BR}(B \to (K^*, K) l^+ l^-)$ doesn't provide any useful constraint and a large boost is possible in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+ l^-)$.

The decay mode $B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma$ is free from helicity suppression and hence has a higher branching ratio than the purely leptonic mode in the SM [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]. In [20] we studied the constraints on $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma)$ coming from the experimentally measured values of the branching ratios of $B \to (K^*, K) l^+ l^-$ and $B \to K^* \gamma$. New physics in the form of scalar/pseudoscalar interactions *does not* contribute to $B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma$ [20, 21]. Also, new physics in form of vector/axial-vector interactions does not provide a large enhancement in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma)$ as these couplings are highly constrained by the data on $B \to (K^*, K) l^+ l^-$. If new physics interactions are in the form of magnetic dipole operators then the present data on $B \to (K^*, K) l^+ l^-$ doesn't put any useful constraint but the data on $B \to K^* \gamma$ puts a very strong constraint [22]. This constraint makes it impossible to get a large boost in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma)$. Therefore, new physics in the form of vector/axial-vector operators or magnetic dipole operators can not boost the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma$ much beyond its predicted SM value [20].

In this paper we are interested in studying the effect of new physics in the form of tensor operators on the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma$. We see if new physics can enhance their branching ratio by an order of magnitude or more, relative to the SM prediction. These operators can appear from the exchange of multiple gluons or spin-2 particles and have been studied in literature in the context of the decays $B \to K^* l^+l^-$ [23, 24, 25, 26], $B \to K l^+l^-$ [27, 28, 29, 30, 31], $B \to X_s l^+l^-$ [32], $B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma$ [33, 34, 35] and $B_s \to \nu\bar{\nu}\gamma$ [36, 37]. In ref. [33, 34, 35], the polarization of the final state leptons in $B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma$, due to these tensor operators, was calculated. Here we investigate the constraints on $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma)$ coming from the present data on both the exclusive semi-leptonic decay $B \to K l^+l^-$ and the inclusive semi-leptonic decay $B \to X_s l^+l^-$, assuming new physics only in the form of tensor operators.

This paper is organized as follows. In section II, we present the theoretical expressions for the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma$ considering new physics in the form of tensor operators. In section III we study the constraints on the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma$ coming from the measurements of $\mathcal{BR}(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-)$ and $\mathcal{BR}(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-)$. Finally in section IV, we present the conclusions.

II. EFFECTIVE HAMILTONIAN AND BRANCHING RATIO OF $B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma$

We consider new physics in the form of tensor operators. The effective Hamiltonian for the quark level transition $b \to s l^+l^-$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}(b \to s l^+l^-) = \mathcal{H}_{SM} + \mathcal{H}_T \ , \tag{1}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{SM} &= \frac{\alpha G_F}{\sqrt{2}\pi} V_{tb} V_{ts}^\star \bigg\{ C_9^{\rm eff} (\bar{s}\gamma_\mu P_L b)\, \bar{l}\gamma_\mu l + C_{10} (\bar{s}\gamma_\mu P_L b)\, \bar{l}\gamma_\mu \gamma_5 l \\
&\quad -2 \frac{C_7^{\rm eff}}{q^2} m_b\, (\bar{s} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu P_R b)\, \bar{l}\gamma_\mu l \bigg\} \ , \qquad (2) \\
\mathcal{H}_T &= \frac{\alpha G_F}{\sqrt{2}\pi} V_{tb} V_{ts}^\star \bigg\{ C_T\ (\bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu} b)\ \bar{l}\sigma^{\mu\nu} l + i\ C_{TE}\ \epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}\ (\bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu} b)\ \bar{l}\sigma_{\alpha\beta} l \bigg\} \ . \qquad (3)
\end{aligned}$$

Here $P_{L,R} = (1 \mp \gamma_5)/2$ and q_μ is the sum of 4-momenta of l^+ and l^-. C_T and C_{TE} are new physics tensor couplings. In our analysis we assume that there are no additional CP phases apart from the single Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) phase. Under this assumption the new physics couplings C_T and C_{TE} are real.

The Wilson coefficients in eq. (2) will be taken to have the following constant values:

$$C_7^{\rm eff} = -0.29 \ , \ C_9^{\rm eff} = +4.214 \ , \ C_{10} = -4.312 \ . \tag{4}$$

We now consider the process $B_s \to l^+ \, l^- \, \gamma$. The necessary matrix element is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \, \gamma \, (k) \, | \overline{s} \, \gamma_\mu \, (1 - \gamma_5) \, b | \, B_s(p_B) \, \rangle \ &= \ \frac{e}{m_{B_s}^2} \Bigg[\in_{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} \, \varepsilon^{*\nu} q^\lambda k^\sigma g \, (q^2) + \, i \left\{ \varepsilon^{\mu *}(kq) \right. \\
&\qquad \left. -(\varepsilon^* q) k^\mu \right\} f(q^2) \Bigg] \, ,
\end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

$$\langle \gamma(k) \, | \overline{s} \sigma_{\mu\nu} b | \, B_s(p_B) \rangle \ = \ \frac{e}{m_{B_s}^2} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\lambda\sigma} \Bigg[G \epsilon^{\lambda *} k^\sigma \ + \ H \epsilon^{\lambda *} q^\sigma \ + \ N(\epsilon^* q) q^\lambda k^\sigma \Bigg] \, , \tag{6}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \gamma(k) \, | \overline{s} i \sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu (1 + \gamma_5) b | \, B_s(p_B) \rangle \ &= \ \frac{e}{m_{B_s}^2} \Bigg[\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\sigma} \, \varepsilon^{\alpha *} q^\beta k^\sigma g_1(q^2) + i \Big\{ \varepsilon_\mu^* (qk) \\
&\qquad -(\varepsilon^* q) k_\mu \Big\} f_1(q^2) \Bigg] \, ,
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where ϵ_μ^* is the polarization vector of the photon and q is the momentum transfer to the dilepton. The amplitude for the process $B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma$ is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
M \ = \ & \frac{\alpha G_F}{4 \sqrt{2} \, \pi} V_{tb} V_{ts}^* \frac{e}{m_{B_s}^2} \Bigg[\Big\{ A_1 \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon^{\nu *} q^\alpha k^\beta + i \, A_2 \Big(\varepsilon_\mu^* (kq) - (\varepsilon^* q) k_\mu \Big) \Big\} \, \bar{\ell} \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma_5) \ell \\
+ \ & \Big\{ B_1 \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \varepsilon^{\nu *} q^\alpha k^\beta + i \, B_2 \Big(\varepsilon_\mu^* (kq) - (\varepsilon^* q) k_\mu \Big) \Big\} \, \bar{\ell} \gamma^\mu (1 + \gamma_5) \ell \\
+ \ & i \, \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \Big\{ G \varepsilon^{\alpha *} k^\beta + H \varepsilon^{\alpha *} q^\beta + N(\varepsilon^* q) q^\alpha k^\beta \Big\} \, \bar{\ell} \sigma^{\mu\nu} \ell \\
+ \ & i \Big\{ G_1 (\varepsilon^{\mu *} k^\nu - \varepsilon^{\nu *} k^\mu) + H_1 (\varepsilon^{\mu *} q^\nu - \varepsilon^{\nu *} q^\mu) + N_1 (\varepsilon^* q)(q^\mu k^\nu - q^\nu k^\mu) \Big\} \, \bar{\ell} \sigma_{\mu\nu} \ell \Bigg] \, ,
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

with

$$A_1 = (C_9^{\rm eff} - C_{10}) g(q^2) - 2 m_b C_7^{\rm eff} \frac{g_1(q^2)}{q^2}, \ A_2 = (C_9^{\rm eff} - C_{10}) f(q^2) - 2 m_b C_7^{\rm eff} \frac{f_1(q^2)}{q^2}, \tag{9}$$

$$B_1 = (C_9^{\rm eff} + C_{10}) g(q^2) - 2 m_b C_7^{\rm eff} \frac{g_1(q^2)}{q^2}, \ B_2 = (C_9^{\rm eff} + C_{10}) f(q^2) - 2 m_b C_7^{\rm eff} \frac{f_1(q^2)}{q^2}; \tag{10}$$

$$G = 4 C_T g_1(q^2), \ N = -4 C_T \left(\frac{f_1(q^2) + g_1(q^2)}{q^2} \right), \ H = N(qk); \tag{11}$$

$$G_1 = -8 C_{TE} g_1(q^2), \ N_1 = 8 C_{TE} \left(\frac{f_1(q^2) + g_1(q^2)}{q^2} \right), \ H_1 = N_1(qk) \ . \tag{12}$$

Here the various coefficients, A_1, A_2 etc, in eq. (8) are expressed in terms of form factors $f(q^2)$, $g(q^2)$, $f_1(q^2)$ and $g_1(q^2)$.

It is convenient to introduce dimensionless variable $x = 2E_\gamma/m_{B_s}$, where E_γ is the photon energy. This gives $q^2 = m_{B_s}^2(1-x)$ and $qk = m_{B_s}^2 x/2$. The limits of integration for x are

$$x_{min} = 0 \ , \quad x_{max} = 1 - 4r \ , \tag{13}$$

where $r = (m_l^2/m_{B_s}^2)$. We consider only hard photon in the process $B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma$. For a photon to be observed experimentally, its minimum energy must be greater than 25 MeV which corresponds to $x \geq 0.01$. Therefore we take $x = 0.01$ as the lower limit of integration.

The calculation of branching ratio gives

$$\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma) = \mathcal{BR}_{SM}(B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma) + \mathcal{BR}_T(B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma) \ , \tag{14}$$

where

$$\mathcal{BR}_{SM}(B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma) = \left(\frac{G_F^2 \alpha^3 m_{B_s}^5 \tau_{B_s}}{256\pi^4}\right) |V_{tb}V_{ts}^\star|^2 \int \phi_{\rm SM}(x) dx \ , \tag{15}$$

$$\mathcal{BR}_T(B_s \to l^+l^-\gamma) = \left(\frac{G_F^2 \alpha^3 m_{B_s}^5 \tau_{B_s}}{96\pi^4}\right) |V_{tb}V_{ts}^\star|^2 (C_T^2 + 4C_{TE}^2) \int \phi_{\rm T}(x) dx \ . \tag{16}$$

The functions ϕ's are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi_{\rm SM}(x) &= x^3\,\beta_l \left[(C_9^{\rm eff^2} + C_{10}^2)\frac{1-x}{3} + (C_9^{\rm eff^2} - C_{10}^2)r\right] \left(f^2(x) + g^2(x)\right) \\
&\quad + 4\hat{m}_b{}^2\, C_7^{\rm eff^2}\, x^3 \beta_l \left[\frac{1}{3(1-x)} + \frac{r}{(1-x)^2}\right] \left(f_1^2(x) + g_1^2(x)\right) \\
&\quad + 4\hat{m}_b\, C_7^{\rm eff}\, C_9^{\rm eff}\, x^3 \beta_l \left[\frac{1}{3} - \frac{r}{1-x}\right] \left(f(x)f_1(x) + g(x)g_1(x)\right) \ , && (17) \\
\phi_{\rm T}(x) &= x^3\,\beta_l\, \left(f_1^2(x) + g_1^2(x)\right) \ , && (18)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\beta_l = \sqrt{1 - \frac{4r}{(1-x)}} \ . \tag{19}$$

In eq. (14), the interference term is neglected because it is proportional to the lepton mass. All such terms are consistently ignored in this calculation.

The x dependence of the form factors is given by [13, 14],

$$f(x) = \frac{0.8\,\mathrm{GeV}/m_{B_s}}{\left[1 - \frac{m_{B_s}^2(1-x)}{(6.5)^2}\right]^2}, \quad g(x) = \frac{1.0\,\mathrm{GeV}/m_{B_s}}{\left[1 - \frac{m_{B_s}^2(1-x)}{(5.6)^2}\right]^2} \ , \tag{20}$$

$$f_1(x) = \frac{0.68\,\mathrm{GeV}^2/m_{B_s}^2}{\left[1 - \frac{m_{B_s}^2(1-x)}{(5.5)^2}\right]^2}, \quad g_1(x) = \frac{3.74\,\mathrm{GeV}^2/m_{B_s}^2}{\left[1 - \frac{m_{B_s}^2(1-x)}{(6.4)^2}\right]^2}. \tag{21}$$

After integration we get,

$$\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma) = \Big[(1.33 \pm 0.40) + (0.11 \pm 0.03)(C_T^2 + 4C_{TE}^2)\Big] \times 10^{-8} \,, \tag{22}$$

where the first term is the SM prediction and the second term is the additional contribution due to new physics tensor operators. The uncertainties quoted in eq. (22) include a 10% uncertainty in the form factors shown in eq. (20) and eq. (21).

We see that the branching ratio depends upon the values of C_T and C_{TE}. Therefore in order to get bounds on $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma)$ we need to know the values of new physics tensor couplings.

III. CONSTRAINTS ON $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma)$

In order to obtain bound on new physics tensor couplings, we first consider the semi-leptonic process $B \to K l^+ l^-$. The decay amplitude for $B(p_1) \to K(p_2)\, l^+(p_+)\, l^-(p_-)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} M\left(B \to K l^+ l^-\right) \;=\; & \frac{\alpha G_F}{2\sqrt{2}\pi} V_{tb} V_{ts}^\star \Bigg[\langle K(p_2)\,| \bar{s}\gamma_\mu b |\, B(p_1)\rangle \left\{ C_9^{\rm eff} \bar{u}(p_-)\gamma_\mu v(p_+) + C_{10} \bar{u}(p_-)\gamma_\mu\gamma_5 v(p_+) \right\} \\ & -2\frac{C_7^{\rm eff}}{q^2} m_b \langle K(p_2)\,| \bar{s} i\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu b |\, B(p_1)\rangle \;\; \bar{u}(p_-)\gamma_\mu v(p_+) \\ & +2C_T \langle K(p_2)\,| \bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu} b |\, B(p_1)\rangle \;\; \bar{u}(p_-)\sigma^{\mu\nu} v(p_+) \\ & +2iC_{TE}\epsilon^{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \langle K(p_2)\,| \bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu} b |\, B(p_1)\rangle \;\; \bar{u}(p_-)\sigma_{\alpha\beta} v(p_+) \Bigg] \,, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

where $q_\mu = (p_1 - p_2)_\mu = (p_+ + p_-)_\mu$. The relevant matrix elements are

$$\langle K(p_2)\,| \bar{s}\gamma_\mu b |\, B(p_1)\rangle \;=\; (2p_1 - q)_\mu f_+(z) + (\frac{1-k^2}{z})\, q_\mu [f_0(z) - f_+(z)] \,, \tag{24}$$

$$\langle K(p_1)\,| \bar{s} i\sigma_{\mu\nu} q^\nu b |\, B(p_1)\rangle \;=\; \Big[(2p_1 - q)_\mu q^2 - (m_B^2 - m_K^2) q_\mu\Big] \frac{f_T(z)}{m_B + m_K} \,, \tag{25}$$

$$\langle K(p_2)\,| \bar{s}\sigma_{\mu\nu} b |\, B(p_1)\rangle \;=\; -i\Big[(2p_1 - q)_\mu q_\nu - (2p_1 - q)_\nu q_\mu\Big] \frac{f_T}{m_B + m_K} \,, \tag{26}$$

where $k \equiv m_K/m_B$ and $\hat{m}_b \equiv m_b/m_B$.

The form factors $f_{+,0,T}$ can be calculated in the light cone QCD approach. Their $z\,(= q^2/m_B^2)$ dependence is given by [38]

$$f(z) = f(0)\, \exp(c_1 z + c_2 z^2 + c_3 z^3) \,, \tag{27}$$

	$f(0)$	c_1	c_2	c_3
f_+	$0.319^{+0.052}_{-0.041}$	1.465	0.372	0.782
f_0	$0.319^{+0.052}_{-0.041}$	0.633	− 0.095	0.591
f_T	$0.355^{+0.016}_{-0.055}$	1.478	0.373	0.700

TABLE I: Form factors for the $B \to K$ transition [38].

where the parameters $f(0), c_1$, c_2 and c_3 for each form factor are given in Table I.

The calculation of branching ratio gives,

$$\mathcal{BR}(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-) = \mathcal{BR}_{SM}(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-) + \mathcal{BR}_T(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-)\ , \tag{28}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{BR}_{SM}(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-) \ &= \ B_{0k} \int \Big[\psi^{3/2}\left(1-\frac{\beta_l^2}{3}\right)(A^2+B^2) \ + \ 4\,\hat{m}_l^2\,\psi^{1/2}\,B^2\,(2+2k^2-z) \\ &\quad + 4\,\hat{m}_l^2\,\psi^{1/2}\,z\,C^2 \ + \ 8\,\hat{m}_l^2\,\psi^{1/2}\,(1-k^2)\,BC\Big]\,dz\ , \qquad (29)\\ \mathcal{BR}_T(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-) \ &= \ B_{0k}\,(C_T^2+4C_{TE}^2)\int \frac{64\,\psi^{3/2}\,z\,f_T^2(z)}{3\,(1+k)^2}\,dz\ . \qquad (30)\end{aligned}$$

A, B and C are linear combinations of form-factors given by

$$A = 2C_9^{eff}\, f_+(z) - 4C_7^{eff}\hat{m}_b\frac{f_T(z)}{1+k}, \quad B = 2C_{10}\, f_+(z), \quad C = 2C_{10}\,\frac{1-k^2}{z}\Big[f_0(z)-f_+(z)\Big]\ , \tag{31}$$

$$\hat{m}_l = m_l/m_B, \quad \psi = 1+k^4+z^2-2(k^2+k^2z+z), \quad \beta_l = \sqrt{1-\frac{4\hat{m}_l^2}{z}}, \quad B_{0k} = \frac{G_F^2\alpha^2\tau_B}{2^{12}\pi^5}|V_{tb}V_{ts}^*|^2 m_B^5\ . \tag{32}$$

The limits of integration for z are

$$z_{min} = 4\hat{m}_l^2\ , \quad z_{max} = (1-k)^2\ . \tag{33}$$

The SM branching ratio for $B \to K\, l^+\, l^-$ in next-to-next leading order (NNLO) is [7]

$$\mathcal{BR}_{SM}(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-) = (3.5 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-7}\ . \tag{34}$$

After integration we get,

$$\mathcal{BR}_T(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-) = (0.31 \pm 0.09) \times (C_T^2 + 4C_{TE}^2) \times 10^{-7}\ . \tag{35}$$

Thus we have

$$\mathcal{BR}(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-) = \Big[(3.5 \pm 1.2) + (0.31 \pm 0.09)(C_T^2 + 4C_{TE}^2)\Big] \times 10^{-7}\ . \tag{36}$$

Equating the R.H.S of eq. (36) with the experimental value of $\mathcal{BR}(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-)$ given in Table II, we obtain

$$C_T^2 + 4C_{TE}^2 = 2.58 \pm 4.17\ . \tag{37}$$

Here all the errors are added in quadrature. Substituting the value of $C_T^2 + 4C_{TE}^2$ in eq. (22), we get

$$\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma) = (1.61 \pm 0.62) \times 10^{-8}\ . \tag{38}$$

Therefore at 3σ, the maximum possible value of $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma)$ is 3.47×10^{-8}. In SM, the 3σ upper bound on $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma)$ is 2.58×10^{-8}. Thus we see that the additional contribution of new physics tensor operators cannot boost the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma$ much beyond its SM prediction.

We now consider the inclusive decay $B \to X_s l^+ l^-$ and see what constraints the experimentally measured value of its branching ratio puts on the tensor operators.

The branching ratio of $B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-$ is given by [32]

$$\mathcal{BR}(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-) = \mathcal{BR}_{SM}(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-) + \mathcal{BR}_T(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-)\ , \tag{39}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{BR}_{SM}(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-) &= B_0\, I_{SM}\ , & (40)\\ \mathcal{BR}_T(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-) &= B_0\, I_T\, (C_T^2 + 4C_{TE}^2)\ . & (41) \end{aligned}$$

The integrals I_{SM} and I_T are given by

$$\begin{aligned} I_{SM} &= \int dz \Bigg[\frac{8u(z)}{z}\left\{1 - z^2 + \frac{1}{3}u(z)^2\right\} C_7^{\rm eff} - 2\,u(z)\left\{z^2 + \frac{1}{3}u(z)^2 - 1\right\}(C_9^{\rm eff\,2} + C_{10}^2) \\ &\quad -16\,u(z)\,(z-1)\,C_9^{\rm eff}\,C_7^{\rm eff}\Bigg]\ , & (42)\\ I_T &= 16\int dz\, u(z)\left[\frac{-2}{3}u(z)^2 - 2z + 2\right]\ , & (43) \end{aligned}$$

where

$$u(z) = (1 - z)\ . \tag{44}$$

$G_F = 1.166 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV^{-2}

$\alpha = 1.0/129.0$

$\alpha_s(m_b) = 0.220$ [39]

$\tau_{B_s} = 1.45 \times 10^{-12}\ s$

$m_{B_s} = 5.366$ GeV

$m_B = 5.279$ GeV

$m_K = 0.497$ GeV

$m_c/m_b = 0.29$ [7]

$m_b = 4.80$ GeV [7]

$V_{tb} = 1.0$

$|V_{ts}| = (40.6 \pm 2.7) \times 10^{-3}$

$|V_{tb} V_{ts}^* / V_{cb}| = 0.967 \pm 0.009$ [40]

$\mathcal{BR}(B \to K\, l^+\, l^-) = (4.30 \pm 0.40) \times 10^{-7}$ [6]

$\mathcal{BR}(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-)_{q^2 > 0.04\,\mathrm{GeV}^2} = (4.3^{+1.3}_{-1.2}) \times 10^{-6}$ [6]

$\mathcal{BR}(B \to X_c \ell \nu) = 0.1061 \pm 0.0016 \pm 0.0006$ [41]

TABLE II: Numerical inputs used in our analysis. Unless explicitly specified, they are taken from the Review of Particle Physics [42].

Here $z \equiv q^2/m_b^2 = (p_{l^+} + p_{l^-})^2/m_b^2 = (p_b - p_s)^2/m_b^2$. The limits of integration for z are now

$$z_{min} = 4m_l^2/{m_b}^2 \ , \quad z_{max} = (1 - \frac{m_s}{m_b})^2 \ , \tag{45}$$

as opposed to the ones given in eq. (33) for the exclusive decay. The normalization factor B_0 is given by

$$B_0 = \mathcal{BR}(B \to X_c e \nu) \frac{3\alpha^2}{16\pi^2} \frac{|V_{ts}^* V_{tb}|^2}{|V_{cb}|^2} \frac{1}{f(\hat{m}_c)\kappa(\hat{m}_c)} \ , \tag{46}$$

where the phase space factor $f(\hat{m}_c = \frac{m_c}{m_b})$, and the $O(\alpha_s)$ QCD correction factor $\kappa(\hat{m}_c)$ of $b \to c e \nu$ are given by [43]

$$f(\hat{m}_c) \ = \ 1 - 8{\hat{m}_c}^2 + 8{\hat{m}_c}^6 - {\hat{m}_c}^8 - 24{\hat{m}_c}^4 \ln \hat{m}_c \ , \tag{47}$$

$$\kappa(\hat{m}_c) \ = \ 1 - \frac{2\alpha_s(m_b)}{3\pi} \left[(\pi^2 - \frac{31}{4})(1 - \hat{m}_c)^2 + \frac{3}{2} \right] \ . \tag{48}$$

The present world average for $B(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-)$ is [6]

$$\mathcal{BR}_{\rm exp}(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-)_{q^2 > 0.04\,{\rm GeV}^2} = (4.3^{+1.3}_{-1.2}) \times 10^{-6}\ . \tag{49}$$

The above branching ratios are given with a cut on the di-lepton invariant mass, $q^2 > 0.04\,{\rm GeV}^2$, in order to remove virtual photon contributions and the $\pi^0 \to ee\gamma$ photon conversion background. We keep the same invariant mass cut, $q^2 > 0.04$ GeV^2, in order to enable comparison with the experimental data. With this range of q^2, the SM branching ratio for $B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-$ in NNLO is [7]

$$\mathcal{BR}_{SM}(B \to X_s\, l^+\, l^-)_{q^2 > 0.04\,{\rm GeV}^2} = (4.15 \pm 0.71) \times 10^{-6}\ , \tag{50}$$

whereas $B_0 I_T = (1.47 \pm 0.22) \times 10^{-6}$. Using equations (39), (49) and (50), we get

$$C_T^2 + 4C_{TE}^2 = 0.10 \pm 1.01\ . \tag{51}$$

Thus we see that the measurements of inclusive rate put a stronger constraint on the tensor operators in comparison to the exclusive decays.

Putting above value in eq. (22), we get

$$\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma) = (1.34 \pm 0.41) \times 10^{-8} \tag{52}$$

At 3σ, the maximum possible value of $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma)$ is 2.57×10^{-8} which is same as the 3σ SM upper bound. Thus we see that the effect of new physics tensor operators to the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma$ is negligible and hence a large enhancement in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma)$ due to such operators is ruled out. As stated earlier, new physics in the form of vector/axial-vector, scalar/pseudoscalar or magnetic dipole operators cannot provide a large boost in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma)$, hence we conclude that a large enhancement in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+\, l^-\, \gamma)$ due to any kind of new physics is not possible.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We are interested in finding the contribution of new physics interactions in the form of tensor operators to the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma$ subject to the constraints coming from the measurements on on the exclusive decay $B \to K l^+ l^-$ and the inclusive decay $B \to X_s l^+ l^-$. These operators do not contribute to purely leptonic decays. They contribute only to semi-leptonic and radiative leptonic decays. We found that the present data on $B \to X_s l^+ l^-$ put strong constraints on these couplings and rules out large enhancement in the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+ l^- \gamma$ in comparison to the SM predictions. In [20] it was shown that new physics in the form of vector/axial vector, scalar/pseudoscalar and magnetic dipole operators cannot provide large enhancement in $\mathcal{BR}(B_s \to l^+ \, l^- \, \gamma)$. Therefore we conclude that no new physics can provide a large enhancement in the branching ratio of $B_s \to l^+ \, l^- \, \gamma$ above its SM predictions.

[1] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 081802 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0404006].

[2] M. Iwasaki *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **72**, 092005 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0503044].

[3] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 221802 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ex/0308042].

[4] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **73**, 092001 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ex/0604007].

[5] A. Ishikawa *et al.* [Belle Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 261601 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ex/0308044].

[6] E. Barberio *et al.*, arXiv:0808.1297 [hep-ex].

[7] A. Ali, E. Lunghi, C. Greub and G. Hiller, Phys. Rev. D **66**, 034002 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0112300].

[8] E. Lunghi, arXiv:hep-ph/0210379.

[9] F. Kruger and E. Lunghi, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 014013 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0008210].

[10] A. Ghinculov, T. Hurth, G. Isidori and Y. P. Yao, Eur. Phys. J. C **33**, S288 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0310187].

[11] A. J. Buras, hep-ph/0101336 and Phys. Lett. B **566** 115 (2003).

[12] A. K. Alok and S. U. Sankar, Phys. Lett. B **620**, 61 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0502120].

[13] G. Eilam, I. E. Halperin and R. R. Mendel, Phys. Lett. B **361**, 137 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9506264].

[14] T. M. Aliev, A. Ozpineci and M. Savci, Phys. Rev. D **55**, 7059 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9611393].

[15] C. Q. Geng, C. C. Lih and W. M. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 074017 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/0007252].

[16] Y. Dincer and L. M. Sehgal, Phys. Lett. B **521**, 7 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0108144].

[17] F. Kruger and D. Melikhov, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 034002 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0208256].

[18] D. Melikhov and N. Nikitin, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 114028 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0410146].

[19] J. X. Chen, Z. Y. Hou and C. D. Lu, Commun. Theor. Phys. **47**, 299 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0611245].

[20] A. K. Alok and S. Uma Sankar, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **22**, 1319 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0603262].

[21] S. R. Choudhury and N. Gaur, Phys. Lett. B **451**, 86 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9810307].

[22] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **70**, 112006 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0407003].

[23] T. M. Aliev, M. K. Cakmak and M. Savci, Nucl. Phys. B **607**, 305 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0009133].

[24] T. M. Aliev, A. Ozpineci and M. Savci, Phys. Lett. B **511**, 49 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0103261].

[25] T. M. Aliev, V. Bashiry and M. Savci, JHEP **0405**, 037 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0403282].

[26] A. S. Cornell, N. Gaur and S. K. Singh, arXiv:hep-ph/0505136.

[27] T. M. Aliev, V. Bashiry and M. Savci, Eur. Phys. J. C **35**, 197 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0311294].

[28] T. M. Aliev, M. K. Cakmak, A. Ozpineci and M. Savci, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 055007 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0103039].

[29] T. M. Aliev, M. Savci, A. Ozpineci and H. Koru, J. Phys. G **24**, 49 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9705222].

[30] A. K. Alok, A. Dighe and S. U. Sankar, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 114025 (2008) [arXiv:0810.3779 [hep-ph]].

[31] C. Bobeth, G. Hiller and G. Piranishvili, JHEP **0712**, 040 (2007) [arXiv:0709.4174 [hep-ph]].

[32] S. Fukae, C. S. Kim, T. Morozumi and T. Yoshikawa, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 074013 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9807254].

[33] U. O. Yilmaz, B. B. Sirvanli and G. Turan, Eur. Phys. J. C **30**, 197 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0304100].

[34] U. O. Yilmaz, B. B. Sirvanli and G. Turan, Nucl. Phys. B **692**, 249 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0407006].

[35] T. M. Aliev, V. Bashiry and M. Savci, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 035013 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0411327].

[36] O. Cakir and B. Sirvanli, Acta Phys. Polon. B **34**, 2643 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0210019].

[37] B. Sirvanli and G. Turan, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **18**, 47 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0211195].

[38] A. Ali, P. Ball, L. T. Handoko and G. Hiller, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 074024 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9910221].

[39] M. Beneke, F. Maltoni and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 054003 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9808360].

[40] J. Charles *et al.* [CKMfitter Group], Eur. Phys. J. C **41**, 1 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0406184].

[41] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 011803 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0404017].

[42] Particle Data Group: C. Amsler *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **667**, 1 (2008).

[43] C. S. Kim and A. D. Martin, Phys. Lett. B **225**, 186 (1989).